



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*CAP*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,685	06/23/2005	Kamel Ramdani	RN02079G1	5010
7590	08/09/2006		EXAMINER	
Jean-Louis Seugnet Rhoda Inc Intellectual Property Dept 259 Prospect Plains Road CN-7500 Cranbury, NJ 08512-7500			NWAONICHA, CHUKWUMA O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1621	

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/518,685	RAMDANI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha	1621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2005.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 20-29 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 20-29 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All   b)  Some \* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 20-29 are pending in the application.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicants' election, filed on 6/13/06 without traverse of Group I (claims 20-29) is acknowledged. Applicants are reminded of their right to file divisional applications to the non-elected claims.

Applicants' are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### ***Priority***

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

### ***Claim Objection***

Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 20 contains a flow diagram. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbaniak et al., {Synthesis and Reactivity in Inorganic and Metal-Organic Chemistry, Synthesis of Siloxyphosphines, 1988, 18 (7), 695-703}.

Applicants claim a continuous process for preparing an organodialkylalkoxysilane by continuously contacting an alcohol with a silane; wherein all the variables are as defined in the claims.

**Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (M.P.E.P. §2141.01)**

Urbaniak et al. teach a process for preparing an organodialkylalkoxysilane by reacting an alcohol with a silane compound. See page 698.

**Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (M.P.E.P. §2141.02)**

Urbaniak et al. process of preparation of organodialkylalkoxysilane by reacting silane compound with an alcohol differs from the instantly claimed process in that Urbaniak et al. process is not a continuous process while applicants claim a process that is continuous.

**Finding of prima facie obviousness–rational and motivation (M.P.E.P. §2142-2143)**

The instantly claimed process of preparation of organodialkylalkoxysilane by reacting silane compound with an alcohol would have been suggested to one of ordinary skill because one of ordinary skill wishing to obtain organodialkylalkoxysilane is taught to employ the processes of Urbaniak et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success in practicing the instant invention by varying the process conditions (batch or continuous process, concentration of the catalyst, reactants, temperature and pressure) from the teaching of Urbaniak et al. to arrive at the instantly claimed method for making organodialkylalkoxysilane by reacting silane compound with an alcohol. Said person would have been motivated to practice the teaching of the reference cited because it demonstrate that organodialkylalkoxysilane are useful industrial raw materials. The Examiner notes that variation the reaction conditions, for example, batch or continuous process, concentration of the reactants, catalyst, temperature and pressure in a chemical reaction is a well-known chemical practice to optimize the process efficiency of the system and does not constitute a patentable distinction. Therefore, the instantly claimed invention would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha whose telephone number is 571-272-2908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman k. Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chukwuma O. Nwaonicha, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit: 1621

THURMAN K. PAGE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

---

Thurman Page,  
Supervisory Patent Examiner,  
Technology Center 1600